

---

# COUNTY OF SAN BERNARDINO GENERAL PLAN ADVISORY COMMITTEE

## MEETING # 16

Joshua Room  
November 17, 2004  
4:00 p.m. to 6:00 p.m.

---

### MEETING OBJECTIVES

- ✦ Status of Technical Review of Background Reports
- ✦ Review and discuss Infrastructure Capacity Background Reports
- ✦ Additional Information regarding Circulation Background Analysis

---

### AGENDA

1. Welcome – Randy Scott, County of San Bernardino
2. Status Report on Technical Review of Draft Background Reports - Frank Wein, URS Corp. (10 minutes)
3. Presentation and Discussion
  - [Infrastructure Capacity Background Report - Part I](#): Water, Wastewater and Solid Waste White Paper (Jeff Rice, URS) (45 mins.)
  - [Infrastructure Capacity Background Report - Part II](#): Public Infrastructure Capacity White Paper (Jeff Rice, URS) (30 mins.)
  - [Update of Circulation and Infrastructure Background Report](#): Additional Information regarding Volume-to-Capacity Ratios (Frank Wein, URS) (30 mins.)
4. Next Steps – Randy Scott, County of San Bernardino and Frank Wein, URS
5. Public Comment: Each speaker will be allowed up to 5 minutes to address the General Plan Advisory Committee

## Summary of GPAC Meeting #15 (September 15, 2004)

The following provides a summary of the last GPAC meeting, including a summary of the presentation of material to the GPAC and the discussion by GPAC members.

The GPAC meeting focused on the need to balance future growth with the ability of the local infrastructure, especially the transportation network, to provide adequate capacity to accommodate future land uses. This is clear in the County's recently adopted General Plan Vision Statement. The following generalized conclusions were drawn to help guide the planning:

- ☐ Significant highway capacity constraints are expected to exist within the Mountain communities as well as connecting routes to the Valley area;
- ☐ Mobility in the East Valley will be adversely affected and constrained by the high increases in freeway travel;
- ☐ Many areas such as Morongo Valley, Hilltop and Lytle Creek will suffer from highway capacity constraints related to relative lack of major arterial facilities, although Lytle Creek is expected to have relatively higher reserve capacity than the other two;
- ☐ Communities in the valley and high desert that have a reasonably dense network of roadways will see very high increases in through as well as locally generated traffic volumes expected to consume a large portion of the system's reserve highway capacity;
- ☐ The much of Mountain Region will be adversely affected by high amounts of additional trips, a degradation of average speeds, but will have moderate amounts of reserve capacity left and will likely be affected by the mobility deficiencies in specific Mountain communities;
- ☐ Some areas of the County such as Bear Valley, Joshua Tree and Lucerne Valley will see sizeable degradation of overall highway capacity, but will still have room to grow and good overall operating conditions.

There are alternative ways of addressing the land use infrastructure interface, particularly in regards to roadway capacity. The alternatives include:

- (a) Improve the roadway capacity with either roadway improvements or new roads;
- (b) Reduce the demand on the circulation system (land use reductions); or
- (c) A combination of both roadway improvement and land use changes.

The GPAC may direct any of the three options on County-wide basis, or direct one approach for one area of the County and another approach for another part of the County. That is, a policy may be to allow additional population growth in the valley planning area but to defer population growth in the desert planning area until circulation improvements are made.